

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LISA LIBERI et al.,	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	NO. 09-1898
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
ORLY TAITZ et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**O R D E R**

**AND NOW**, this **25th** day of **June, 2009**, it is hereby **ORDERED** that a rule is **ISSUED** upon Plaintiffs to show cause as to why their Complaint should not be dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction.<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a rule is **ISSUED** upon Plaintiffs to show cause why this case should not be severed into three (3) or fewer cases against the following groups of Defendants: (1) Edgar & Caren Hale, Plains Radio Network, Bar H. Farms and KPRN AM 1610; (2) Linda S. Belcher; (3) Orly Taitz, Defend Our Freedoms Foundations, Inc., Neil Sankey, Sankey Investigations, Inc. and The Sankey Firm.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs must support their response with specific facts, in the form of affidavits or other admissible evidence, which support that the Eastern District of Pennsylvania is the proper forum for this litigation as to each Defendant.

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs must support their response with specific facts, in the form of affidavits or other admissible evidence, which demonstrate a common scheme or purpose among all of the Defendants such that it would be appropriate to try these Defendants in a single case.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a rule is issued upon Plaintiffs to show cause why this case should not be transferred to an appropriate district in either Texas or California, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).<sup>3</sup>

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that these rules are returnable on Plaintiffs by **Monday, July 27, 2009**. Defendants shall have until **Wednesday, August 26, 2009** to reply to Plaintiffs' responses.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Eduardo C. Robreno

**EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.**

---

<sup>3</sup> In their response, Plaintiffs must address the specific public and private interests that apply in this case, as articulated by the Third Circuit in Jumara v. State Farm Ins. Co., 55 F.3d 873, 879-80 (3d Cir. 1995).